



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the article it is "at such a point in the approach of the danger," i. e., *the* well-known danger of the approaching battle. If the "partition" of the idea "the approach of danger" seems difficult and unnatural, it is only necessary to recall Thucydides' ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ τοῦ καιροῦ; it is the Greek, and not the English, way of putting it. Finally, to return to Mr. Shorey's claim that the genitive is absolute because ἐν τοιούτῳ refers to ὑπισχνεί, it is evident that if the words mean "at such a point in the approach of the danger," the "such" can either refer back to ὑπισχνεί or—and this is more natural—to the present, well-recognized situation. In either case τοιούτῳ refers backward, as Mr. Shorey claims it should, and the genitive is still left partitive. Vollbrecht, by the way, calls the genitive absolute; Goodwin is doubtful. I incline to the partitive view myself. It is probable enough that ἐν τοιούτῳ with a partitive genitive existed in Greek before the development of the absolute construction, and it seems to me likely that a genitive following closely upon ἐν τοιούτῳ would always have suggested the partitive meaning. But I see no reason why the Greek could not have said "because you are in such a position—the danger being close at hand." The absolute construction would be an explanatory afterthought; it would be more natural in speaking than in writing.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that most of the manuscripts have τοῦ κινδύνου τοῦ προσιόντος. The editors generally omit the second τοῦ on the authority of the Paris C.

A. G. LAIRD

#### XENOPHON *ANAB.* i. 7. 5 AGAIN

I doubt whether there is any cogent reason for finding in the passage *Anab.* i. 7. 5 a different construction from those cited by Goodwin 1088. The article here has evidently a slightly demonstrative force and refers to the particular peril now impending. The participle has the position at the end of the sentence for rhetorical emphasis: the danger is the one now approaching. The speaker expected the king to attack at once. Kendrick translates the passage, "in such a crisis of danger," and more fully at another place, "because you are in such a crisis of coming danger." He explains that "κινδύνου depends on neut. τοιούτῳ; προσιόντος (omit τοῦ with the best MSS) attached predicately to κινδύνου." However, the multiplication of modern authorities in such cases profiteth little. Thucydides vii. 69 has ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἤδη τοῦ καιροῦ ὄντες ἄνθρωποι, which Jowett translates "at such times," and Bloomfield "in such a conjuncture." Here the demonstrative force of τοῦ is evidently emphasized

by ἡδη. In Thucyd. iii. 49 we have παρὰ τοσούτων . . . . κινδύνου, which is virtually the same construction without the article. The particular construction here employed seems to be unique—at least I find no similar one by a tolerably careful examination of the *Anabasis*. If the passage is really Xenophon's own, I believe the above explanation will suffice. On the other hand, as the speech is a short one and was made on a specially important occasion, the historian may have remembered it literally, in which case it is not wise to apply the rules of rhetoric too rigidly. If the second person were not implied in the verb, we should probably have it expressed with the infinitive. As the sentence stands, it is not ambiguous. To explain the three genitives as a case of the absolute construction seems to detract from the compactness of the sentence.

CHARLES W. SUPER

ATHENS, OHIO

#### THE MEANING OF δέξεται, AESCHYLUS *PROMETHEUS* 860

In only one of my new interpretations of the *Prometheus* does Mr. Bonner decide in favor of Wecklein.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this paper is to show that the position of the German scholar here too (v. 860) can not be successfully defended. Mr. Bonner speaks of my "curt dismissal" of Wecklein's note as "not convincing." In the narrow compass of a note, in an edition in which the plan of annotation demanded that brevity be constantly studied, it was impossible to publish the reasons in full for my interpretation.

Mr. Bonner admits that the passages cited by Wecklein are "not exactly analogous." The only defense of the traditional interpretation offered is: "in view of vss. 856-59 it seems much more natural to supply αὐτοῖς with Wecklein, whose defense of the peculiar construction seems sufficient." But the difficulty does not lie in the construction—δαμέντων for δαμέντας is easy—an example of a common phenomenon in Aeschylus to which I had already called attention.

In the first place, the very fact that Wecklein proposes δ'αἰμάζεται shows (1) that he is not satisfied himself with δέξεται (which is found in all the manuscripts), and (2) that he can not get away from the idea that the verb has to do with the pursuers rather than the pursued. The same may be said of Pauw, who changes δέξεται to δέρεται and δαμέντων to δαμέντας. Hartung does even greater violence to the text and changes δέξεται to κλάγεται.

<sup>1</sup>In his review of my edition in the March number of this *Journal*.